Case 2:04-cv-00029-LKK-DAD Document 20 Filed 05/27/05 Page 1 of 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 GLORIA SALTER,

NO. CIV. S-04-29 LKK/DAD

ORDER

12

13

14

1516

17

18

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

V.

ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; and U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERAN'S AFFAIRS,

Plaintiffs,

Defendants.

In an order dated May 16, 2005, the court ordered plaintiff to show cause in writing why sanctions should not issue for failure to file a timely opposition in accordance with Local Rule 78-230. The court is in receipt of plaintiff counsel's response. No good cause being shown, counsel for plaintiff is SANCTIONED in the amount of one hundred and fifty (\$150.00) dollars. This sum shall be paid to the Clerk of the Court no later than thirty (30) days from the effective date of this order.

26 ////

Counsel shall file an affidavit accompanying the payment of this sanction which states that it is paid personally by counsel, out of personal funds, and is not and will not be billed, directly or indirectly, to the client or in any way made the responsibility of the client as attorneys' fees or costs.

In the May 16, 2005 Order, the court also continued the May 23, 2005 law and motion date to June 13, 2005. In addition to the response to the Order to Show Cause, counsel for plaintiff has requested an extension of time to respond to defendant's motion for summary judgment, explaining to the court that he only learned of the filing of the motion last Thursday, May 19, 2005, when he ran into defense counsel at the courthouse. He explains that this late notification was due to a change in his e-mail address which is not on file with the court.

No good cause have been shown, the court would ordinarily deny such a request.¹ Despite plaintiff's counsel's lack of diligence, given the potential prejudice to his client, the hearing on the motion for summary judgment presently before the court is CONTINUED

Plaintiff's counsel is directed to Local Rule 83-182(f). The court emphasizes that it is counsel's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current e-mail address. The court is also compelled to note that it looks with skepticism upon plaintiff's counsel's explanation that he failed to receive the summary judgment motion because his e-mail address,

<u>RKWerner@iwincases.net</u>, did not allow for his receipt of the motion for summary judgment. The court's own investigation reveals that plaintiff's counsel updated his e-mail address with the court to <u>RKWerner@iwincases.net</u> on March 2, 2005, and that since that time the court has received no "bounced back" messages on that particular address, strongly suggesting that plaintiff's counsel has received and continues to receive notices from the court and other parties.

Case 2:04-cv-00029-LKK-DAD Document 20 Filed 05/27/05 Page 3 of 3

| 1 | to July 18, 2005 where it will be called on the court's regularly |
|----|---|
| 2 | scheduled Law and Motion Calendar, beginning at 10:00 a.m. Ir |
| 3 | addition, the court makes the following ORDERS: |
| 4 | 1. Plaintiff shall electronically file and serve any |
| 5 | opposition papers to defendant's motion for partial summary |
| 6 | judgment by no later than June 24, 2005. |
| 7 | 2. Defendant shall electronically file and serve any reply |
| 8 | to plaintiff's opposition by no later than July 1, 2005. |
| 9 | 3. All parties shall e-mail a copy of their briefs in Word |
| 10 | or Wordperfect format to Tim Hinkle, Judicial Assistant, at |
| 11 | thinkle@caed.uscourts.gov. |
| 12 | IT IS SO ORDERED. |
| 13 | DATED: May 27, 2005. |
| 14 | /s/Lawrence K. Karlton |
| 15 | LAWRENCE K. KARLTON SENIOR JUDGE |
| 16 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |